

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the Final Office Action of July 10, 2008 is respectfully requested.

Enclosed is a Two-Month Extension of Time with requisite fee.

In the Office Action there is indicated the original drawing set was indicated as being objectionable under 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). Accompanying this Amendment is a complete set of Replacement Drawing Sheets (i.e., all original drawing sheets have been replaced with a Replacement Drawing Sheet) in an effort to address the objections raised in the Office Action and the Draftperson's Review sheet. As seen many of the photocopy drawing sheets found objectionable in the Office Action have been replaced by redrafted, replacement formal drawings. In addition, there has been avoided the mixing of non-lettered and lettered Figure legends under a common Figure number, by adding in the first appearance of each number/letter series a reference to a base "X" Figure followed by a sequence of Figure legend number/letter sequence. It is respectfully submitted that this presents a clear set of Figures under 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d).

In view of the new Replacement Drawing Sheet set accompanying this response, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 29 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In view of the cancellation of claims 29 and 49 herein, this rejection is non-applicable.

In the present Amendment the claims have been amended as summarized below:

A) Claim 18 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of the now dependent cancelled claims 22 and 24. That is, previous dependent claim 24 (24/22/18) has been represented as current independent claim 18. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that no new issues are raised by this reformatting of the previously presented claim 24.

B) Dependent claim 23 (23/18) has been altered to conform with the changes to claim 18 noted above.

C) Claim 26 (26/25) was noted as containing allowable subject matter and has been incorporated into independent claim 25 (claim 26 thus being canceled) to render the current independent claim 25 in immediate condition for allowance.

D) Claims 19, 22, 24, 26-35, 37, and 39-55 currently stand canceled (the cancelation of claims should not be misconstrued as an acceptance of the rejections raised but have been made to further prosecution in the context of the present application).

E) A word in Claim 36 has been amended for better conformity with the preceding phrase.

In the Office Action, the non-withdrawn claims were rejected under the prior art as summarized in the below presented "Table of Rejections".

Ref.	Claims	Statutory Grounds	Reference(s)
A	18-23, 29, 43, 49-51, 56 and 57	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(b)</b>	Cramer (6,039,827)
B	24	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Cramer in view of Gusmer et al (4,199,303)
C	31-36, 38, 41 and 53-55	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Cramer in view of Bezaire (6,315,161)
D	44 and 45	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Cramer in view of Buse (4,871,301)
E	44, 45, 47 and 48	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Cramer in view of Claasen (4,898,527)
F	25, 27-29, 43, 44 and 49	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(b)</b>	Buse (4,871,301)
G	18-20, 22, 23, 45, 50-52, 56 and 57	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Buse in view of Cramer
H	47 and 48	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Buse in view of Cramer and further in view of Classen
I	31-36, 38, 41 and 53	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Buse in view of Bezaire

As noted above, amongst the foregoing claim amendments it is noted that claim 26, which was noted as representing a claim representing allowable subject matter, has been rewritten into independent format by placing the subject matter of the now cancelled claim 26 into independent claim 25 to place that claim in immediate condition for allowance.

As to independent claim 18 (former claim 24), this claim subject matter was rejected under rejection B above. Current claim 18 features the language of former claim 24 (24/22/18). Thus, current independent claim 18 includes the following features:

*wherein said drive transmission system includes a drive transmission shaft, and said pump unit includes an inlet pump manifold and an outlet pump manifold with said shroud fastened to said outlet pump manifold, and said outlet pump manifold includes a manifold reception cavity within which said drive transmission shaft axially extends, and said drive transmission shaft is supported by a first bearing device also received within the manifold reception cavity of said output pump manifold, and  
wherein said inlet pump manifold and outlet pump manifold are in a vertically stacked arrangement with said inlet manifold having a filter extending across a lower region of said inlet manifold*

In Rejection B there was indicated that the schematic depiction of the in-line filter 21 of Gusmer's reference represented the filter featured in the claim arrangement above. The disclosure corresponding to this asserted feature in Gusmer is set out in col. 2, lines 33 to 35 which indicates "the resin supply proceeds through conduit 19 and filter 21 to a resin feed pump". Thus, there is lacking any disclosure or suggestion of the current claim 18 (former claim 24 arrangement). That is, unlike the claimed invention, the schematic "through conduit" arrangement for filter 21 is considered to be removed from the claimed stacked arrangement with filter positioned across the lower region of the inlet manifold. An exemplary embodiment of such an arrangement is seen, for example, in Figures 94 and 95 of the present application. This claimed arrangement is unlike that contemplated in the in conduit filter arrangement featured in Gusmer. This distinction relative to Gusmer's in line filter is made more apparent with reference to the conduit filter 8 shown in US Pat. No. 4,096,585.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that current independent claim 18 and its dependents also stands in condition for allowance together with claim 25.

The remaining pending independent claim, claim 36, is also respectfully submitted to be allowable. Claim 36 was rejected under rejections C and I above, and thus each is discussed below.

Claim 36, among other features, includes the following feature:

*an inlet manifold flow stopper which is dimensioned to preclude back flow out of said inlet manifold when said input valve assembly is detached from said inlet manifold*

While this feature of claim 36 is not specifically discussed in the Office Action, it is assumed that reliance is placed on the secondary reference to Bezaire in each of rejections C and I (as the base references are in no way directed at such a feature). However, a review of Bezaire

reveals that it utilized an internalized "ball check assembly 68" internally positioned within its hand dispenser, but fails to reveal an arrangement like that featured in claim 36 of the present application and thus so too does the combination of rejections relied upon in rejections C and I. An illustration of an exemplary embodiment of Claim 36 is seen in Figure 77 and the corresponding disclosure on pages 114 and 115 of the present application.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it courteously is urged that all of the remaining claims are allowable and that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action in this regard is earnestly solicited.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account 02-4300; Order No. 034017R004.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:

  
Dennis C. Rodgers, Reg. No. 32,936  
1130 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1130  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: December 10, 2008